

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 remain pending in the application including independent claims 1 and 11. New dependent claims 22-24 have been added.

It appears as if the examiner has examined the claims in the form as originally filed; however, the claims were amended in response to the International Search Report and Written Opinion; a copy of the previously filed response to the International Search Report and Written Opinion was enclosed with the U.S. National Stage Application. The above amendments, which solely removed reference numbers and added three new dependent claims, are based on the claims as previously amended under Article 19, which should have been examined by the examiner. Moreover, as the Office Action pertained to the wrong set of claims, should the Examiner decide to issue another Office Action, it is respectfully requested that such Office Action also be made Non-Final.

Claims 8, 16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The rejections set forth by the examiner no longer apply to the claims, as these claims were amended in response to the Written Opinion. Thus, applicant respectfully asserts that claims 8, 16, and 18 are fully compliant with 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 1, 10, 11, 13-16, and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Liston (US 5366045). First, claim 1 recites the feature of a ropeless and sheaveless stopping mechanism that is responsive to an electronic control signal to “automatically stop an *elevator car* under predetermined conditions.” Liston does not disclose an elevator car, and does not disclose a stopping mechanism for an elevator car. Instead, Liston is directed to a lifting vehicle that moves horizontally along rails 16, 30 and lifts items upward for storage.

Second, claim 1 (as previously amended) includes features set forth in original claims 2 and 8. Specifically, claim 1 recites the feature of at least one spring for moving the stopping mechanism from a non-deployed position to a deployed position in response to an electronic control signal wherein the at least one spring is resettable from a remote location in response to an electronic reset signal. The examiner admits that Liston does not disclose a stopping

mechanism that is resettable from a remote location in response to an electronic reset signal (see Page 6, Item 20 of the present Office Action). Thus, Liston does not anticipate claim 1. For similar reasons Liston does not anticipate claim 11.

Claims 2-6, 8, 12, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liston in view of West et al. (US 4518153). The examiner relies on West to teach a stopping mechanism that is remotely resettable in response to an electronic reset signal. Applicant respectfully asserts that West does not disclose such a mechanism. West discloses that the brake actuator 26 is mechanically actuated via a mechanical cable 27 (see col. 4, lines 53-66) and is reset using a reset cable (see col. 7, line 61 through col. 8, line 10). Thus, contrary to the examiner's assertion, West does not disclose, suggest, or teach resetting in response to an electronic reset signal.

Thus, claims 1-21 are allowable over the recited combination. For similar reasons to those set forth above, new claims 22-24 are also allowable. Fees in the amount of \$156.00 for three additional dependent claims may be charged to the credit card on file. Applicant believes that no additional fees are necessary, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kerrie A. Laba/

Kerrie A. Laba, Reg. No. 42,777
Carlson, Gaskey & Olds
400 W. Maple Road, Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: February 23, 2009